

## DECISIVE VICTORY FOR AMERICANISM IN PORTLAND, ORE.

As we go to press, news comes of another decisive municipal victory for the patriotic upholders of fundamental democracy. Portland, Oregon, has just elected twenty-seven out of thirty-three candidates endorsed by the patriotic voters of the city. Here, as in Kansas City, and other important municipalities where the patriots have simply adopted the tactics of political Romanism, since the Knights of Columbus and the American Federation of Catholic Societies got actively into politics, the patriotic upholders of the democracy of Jefferson, Washington and Lincoln, have met the hierarchy at its own game, and have won. Full particulars of the great victory, next week. Every patriot should read this story giving another illustration of how the friends of free institutions can win the day in city, state and nation, next November.

## R. C. CONGRESSMEN DEFEAT HOME RULE

Oppose Philippine Independence Because "Church Dignitaries" So Willed-- Bolt Their Party Caucus, Desert Their Own Administration, Ignore the Platform Pledge of Their Party, and Revolt Against President-- All to Protect Papal Property Interests in the Islands

ON the first day of the "blessed month of Mary" one of those mysterious happenings occurred in congress which the average editor fails to explain because he doesn't dare to tell the truth about it. On May 1, thirty Democratic congressmen, repudiating the action of their own party caucus, voted with the Republicans in the House of Representatives to defeat the administration measure providing for the independence of the Philippine Islands from two to four years.

The House had under consideration Senate bill 381, already passed by that body with the approval of President Wilson to redeem the pledge made in the Democratic platform. In addition to providing a more efficient administration for the Philippine Islands, it contained what was known as the Clarke amendment, a party measure designed to grant independence to the Filipinos within four years from its passage and approval.

One can readily understand why Republican congressmen lined up solidly against the bill. They desired whatever credit might be claimed for so great an act to redound to their own party. They did not intend for the Democratic administration to get any glory by means of their votes. The Republicans may be in power next year, and their leaders wished to save to themselves and their own party whatever approval might fall to the freedom-giving administration.

But the Democrats had plenty of votes to pass the bill at the present time. Each and every one of them was duty bound to support it because of the pledges made in the national platform upon which they had campaigned and had been elected. Wherefore the amazement of the whole country when the Clarke amendment, granting Philippine independence, was defeated by a decisive vote of 213 to 165--defeated because thirty NOMINAL Democrats turned against the measure they were morally bound to support, and voted solidly against it.

The press comment on this most extraordinary occurrence has been most voluminous. It was generally supposed that Philippine independence was assured; and that the bill would go through with the united support of a Democratic congress. Most Democratic papers stoutly declare that these thirty revolting congressmen of their party had united to embarrass President Wilson. But what was the motive? That it has embarrassed the president, none can doubt; but he says not a word to heighten their supposed satisfaction. The White House seems reluctant to say anything concerning this mishap to party and presidential plans. More mystery.

Fortunately, there is a press correspondent who sees this matter as it is; and who gives us the interpretation thereof in the New York Evening Post of May 8. The gentlemen's name is David Lawrence, and he seems to be a regular Washington correspondent of the paper which prints his solution of the puzzle: Says he:

### An Extraordinary Occurrence

Who killed the Philippine Independence bill in the House the other day? Not a Democratic insurgency that reasoned in consonance with Republican doctrine that the people of the Philippines are not now and never will be fit for self-government; not the broad-voiced Democrats who foresee diplomatic entanglements in the Far East that made it seem wiser not to compromise the United States in these times of stress with any future pledge; not the Democrats who wanted to show their indifference to President Wilson's desires, their freedom from executive coercion.

Washington has been seething with gossip about one of the most extraordinary occurrences in the history of the American congress, an event obscured by greater problems that are before the public; a roll call lost in the concurrence of interests opposed to the bill and conveniently forgotten because to make further controversy over the matter would serve no useful purpose.

If the responsible officers of the Administration would speak out, if the Democratic leaders in congress would dare to say it, the influence of a political element in the Catholic church would be held up as the single thing that caused

revolt in the Democratic ranks. That is the confident belief of many people in the administration, who will tell you incidentally that out of the thirty Democrats who voted against independence thereby insuring its defeat, all but one or two were Catholics, whereas out of 164 Democrats voting for the bill only two or three were Catholics. The galaxy of Irish names recorded against Philippine independence presented to many here a humorous paradox in view of the recent efforts on behalf of independence made by members of the same race in other parts of the globe.

There you have it, plain as plainness can make it; not from THE MENACE, or the Guardians of Liberty, or the Masons, or from any of those persons or organizations which are said to be intent upon misrepresenting the blessed church of the centuries; but from a newspaper man who knows the news when he sees it, and, in this instance has put it past the Roman Catholic censorship, into print. And Mr. Lawrence does not leave us with a mere statement and bare assertion. He also tells us why these twenty-odd papists moved in a body to desert their party caucus and antagonize the administration of which they are supposed to be a sympathetic part. He continues:

But there was no paradox in the vote, no contradiction that cannot be explained. In fact, some days before the final vote was taken ominous warnings were heard in administration quarters of the certain defeat of the bill, "because the church was against it." Also, a few who voted for the bill were heard to remark that they cast their votes because they wanted to register their opposition "to the church." One member of congress who voted against the bill remarked in a moment of indignation that certain church dignitaries wanted the bill killed, and he proposed to follow their advice. He mentioned names, too.

To whom did these Roman Catholic congressmen yield their first allegiance? To the sovereign on the Tiber, or to the Democracy voiced in the Declaration of Independence, inserted in the Democratic platform and urged by the Democrat president? Here we have a concrete illustration of a fact that is constantly in evidence, and that gives emphasis to the contention of patriots that Roman Catholics are warring against our constitution and the genius of our free institutions BECAUSE THEY OWE AND YIELD THEIR FIRST ALLEGIANCE TO A FOREIGN SOVEREIGNTY. They are hyphenated Americans in the worst sense of the term, since their first allegiance is yielded not to America but to a foreign sovereign.

### Bluffed Into Silence

The correspondent further assures us that many in Washington knew the coterie of Roman Catholic lobbyists who were busily engaged in the effort to kill Philippine independence; yet "not a voice was heard in debate courageous enough to characterize the opposition." He expresses the belief that if the Washington lobby which carried on this work were exposed it would be "repudiated by broad-minded Catholics." Mr. Lawrence hasn't yet discovered that the broad-minded souls of that communion were long ago excommunicated; and that the honest ones who remain are classed as "children of the alleged church without any voice whatever in its management. Further:

The administration is making no complaint. It accepted its defeat with good grace. It was not a personal revolt against the president. Casual examination of the list of the men who voted against independence will reveal some staunch friends of Mr. Wilson, men whose names have been aligned with his many times in the past and will continue to be in the future. All the more reason, indeed, why the charge of Catholic influence carries conviction.

There are a great many people here who believe it was a good thing that the bill was killed yet who do not approve of the methods by which it was sent to its death. The applause that was given to the revolting Democrats for their "high-minded" stand was predicated on the supposition that they really had assessed the problems involved in Philippine independence, and had arrived at a serious conclusion on the subject. How little this was true is admitted privately, though thoughtfully, by some of the very men who helped kill the measure.

So it seems that in Washington, D. C., the political Romanists actually do admit some things privately with which THE MENACE has

charged them publicly. How haughtily they declare with the air of injured innocence that they were elected as patriotic Americans without any consideration of their church affiliations. And yet, how effectively they work together as subjects of their pope when the interests of the Roman Catholic corporation demand it. The following is rather apologetic; but the reader can readily separate the wheat from the chaff and get the essence without having to swallow the sweetening:

### "Immense Property Holdings"

As for the Catholic church's interest in defeating the legislation, there is no gaining its equity. It had natural and legitimate aspirations over the situation. The church has immense property holdings in the Philippines. These might be disturbed if unrest were to be bred by a pledge of early independence. Holding this conviction, the church exercised its right as an interested party to express its view. What distinguished observers here do not like about the business was the secrecy with which the campaign was conducted and the solid vote along religious lines that followed. Having found that the administration leaders did not believe the property of the Catholic church or its influence in the islands would be jeopardized by the bill that was up for passage, the people who represented the property owners kept up their fight, carrying it deftly to the men who were religiously sympathetic or feared that opposition to the church might defeat them in their districts.

"The church has immense property holdings in the Philippines." This fact shows what Rome has been doing in those islands all these centuries. The kind of morality it has fostered is told in that Senate Document No. 190 of some years ago which reveals the gross immorality of the friars. The kind of education it has promoted was shown by the condition of the natives when our own government began its work of public education. It has been busy accumulating these "immense property holdings" WHICH ITS SERVANTS IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES ARE NOW SO BUSILY SCREAMING TO HOLD.

Note how these managers also hold the fear of defeat over congressmen from districts where there is a papist vote sufficient to threaten them with IS ROME IN POLITICS? Most assuredly; and in business, too. Its agents have been driving a profitable business in the Philippines as proved by these same "property holdings." They carried on another profitable business in Mexico until their graft became so intolerable that the people rose in revolt.

Rome wishes the United States to stay in the Philippines for the same reason that its managers wish the United States to intervene in Mexico. These thrifty collectors of "immense" properties wish Uncle Sam to hold the Mexican and the Filipino while they plunder them. They are business men who know their business. They have influence in this country where the people are fuddled with religious pretenses, and politicians can be whipped into line by the methods alluded to in what we have quoted.

How long is it going to take for honest citizens of this republic to learn, with Rome teaching the needed lessons so openly and plainly? It does seem that even the dead would take some note of such political work by a band of conspirators even when they operate under the guise of pretended religion.

### Fitzgerald Shines Again

In this connection we should not overlook the special and extraordinary part taken by the notorious papist congressman, John J. Fitzgerald, of New York, in denying the home rule to the Filipinos that he and his kind have so long pretended to desire for the Irish. After the House had defeated and removed Section 34 of the Philippine bill (the section providing for independence) it then passed the bill with other amendments; and we find the following on page 8182 of the Congressional Record:

Mr. FITZGERALD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

the motion of the gentleman from New York that the House insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference. The motion was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD: Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion to instruct the conferees, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The clerk read as follows:

Mr. Fitzgerald offers the following: "That the managers on the part of the House are instructed not to agree to any declaration or provision setting a definite time, or fixing a definite period, at or within which the Philippines shall be granted independence."

Mr. FITZGERALD: Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

THE SPEAKER: The question is on ordering the previous question. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GARRETT) there were--ayes 191, nays 149.

So here we have the illuminating spectacle of a Roman Catholic Fitzgerald administering the final knockout blow, to a Home Rule bill such as he and his kind have practiced everything, from Hibernian oratory to revolt to wrest from the government of another country. We have the key to the inconsistency when we remember that Home Rule for Ireland means Rome Rule for Ireland; and that Home Rule for the Philippine Islands means that Rome would have to get out of the islands as she got out of Mexico.

Every effort of this Fitzgerald has been in behalf of political Romanism from the time he introduced his bill to muzzle the American press to this latest denial of Home Rule to the Filipinos. And the twenty-odd birds of the Catholic congressional covey are of precisely the same feather. THEY ARE IN CONGRESS TO REPRESENT ROME AND TO MISREPRESENT EVERYTHING ELSE.

There can be no independence for any people so long as the power, that uses its Fitzgeralds, Gallivans, et al, for such purposes, is voted into power by a solid Roman Catholic vote aided by a non-Roman Catholic vote that has been rendered innocuous by papal soothing syrup administered by Jesuits and Knights of Columbus highly paid lecturers on "religious prejudice."

## KEEP A STRAIGHT RECORD

BY REV. THEO. C. WALKER

FRIEND in New Hampshire sends a postal card article worth a page of platitudes. He says: "Maryland granted religious liberty to all for the manifest reason that Lord Baltimore received his charter from a Protestant king. On the other hand, Roger Williams established religious toleration in Rhode Island from principle. It is no credit to a church not to persecute what it lacked the power."

Our friend could have truthfully added that a majority of the Maryland colonists were Protestants and not Romanists, hence religious liberty.

This distinction is fine and true to history. Rome has always used the government when she was in the ascendancy, and tolerated when dispossessed to do so. Just now she tolerates, but with a president, congress, and supreme court obedient to the pope, Protestants would be made to tremble. She intimidates now; she molests, she kidnaps, she murders now by the hand of the Knights of Columbus.

The Inquisition has already started. Are you unconcerned? Make it impossible, by your vote, for Rome to secure the ascendancy.

## Senator Bryan, of Florida

N. P. Bryan, Florida's worst political mistake, is rapidly qualifying himself for the "extinguished" class at the close of his term in 1917. In a speech, appropriately delivered in the criminal court room, at Tampa, he launched into one of those tirades, against the Guardians of Liberty and the patriotic movement, such as mark the tools of popery. He is particularly grieved over secret political societies, so far as patriotic societies are concerned; but always speaks in behalf of the biggest secret political society on earth, the so-called Roman Catholic church.

The Knights of Columbus, who recently tried to disfranchise the best Democrats of Florida by means of a state-committee gag rule, do not bother the senator in the least. It is only those societies, which oppose papal and priestly meddling in American politics, that call down the wrath of this handy man of papal politicians.

The good people of Florida, will, no doubt, attend to this gentleman's case in due time. In the meantime they can profitably observe and check up his efforts in behalf of Rome.

## Colorado Awakening

The Colorado Law Enforcement and Enforcement League, is circulating petitions for signatures of legal electors to initiate an inspection law as follows:

"To provide for the inspection of all public and private hospitals, reformatory homes, houses of detention, asylums, sectarian seminaries, schools and institutions, (except such state institutions wherein inspection and control are now provided by law, by the county commissioners of the county in which such institutions are situated, or by the grand jury thereof, or by a committee appointed by a judge of a court of record upon a petition signed by twenty legal electors of the county, or by any elective state official of the state of Colorado,"

## KENTUCKY CONGRESSMAN ON WAR PATH

A Roman Catholic Congressman Makes a Spectacle of Himself--Ben Johnson, of Kentucky, Enraged at Criticism of His Juvenile Court Bill in The Menace--Having His Tirade Printed and Mailed in Great Quantities at Public Expense

On Saturday, April 22, Roman Catholic Representative Ben Johnson, of Kentucky delivered on the floor of the National House of Representatives a characteristically intemperate and misleading tirade of abuse against THE MENACE because of criticisms which had been published against the kidnapping juvenile court bill for the District of Columbia, written by priest Kirby and others and introduced in congress by Johnson himself. The good people of the fourth Kentucky district have a right to know the truth concerning matters contained in his intemperate ranting against THE MENACE.

Mr. Johnson is now having his unseemly and misleading vituperations printed at the Government Printing Office and carried through the mails in vast quantities to every part of the country under his franking privilege and at the government's expense long after the bill has passed the house. He can have no other incentive for this than to make a malicious and unfair fight against THE MENACE at immense expense to the American people and for his own personal gratification and that of the papal hierarchy that he so diligently serves.

The dangerous provisions of Johnson's juvenile court bill were first brought to the attention of the Free Press Defense League bureau by patriotic citizens and parents in the District of Columbia, who know the unseemly conditions obtaining under the jurisdiction of the present juvenile court during Mr. Johnson's term in congress. Since the pending bill greatly enlarges the powers of the juvenile court, parents in the District, mindful of shameful abuses which Rome has forced into the juvenile court under the present law, stood in awe at the prospect of having the powers of that court so enlarged.

In the year 1912, during the life of the 62nd Congress, of which Mr. Johnson was a member, the Lutheran Ministerial Association of Washington, D. C., adopted the following resolutions which were filed in congress, and which show something of the work Rome was then doing in the juvenile court:

Whereas: The Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia, Hon. William H. DeLacy, judge, in handling cases coming before it, frequently orders and requires young girls to undergo medical examination with a view to securing evidence of sexual intercourse, which we submit is unnecessary, subversive to good morals, and without warrant of law; and Whereas: The said Juvenile Court, Hon. William H. DeLacy, judge, from time to time commits GIRLS TO A SECTARIAN AND RELIGIOUS INSTITUTION KNOWN AS THE "HOUSE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD," of this city, which is under the management and control of the Roman Catholic church, which we submit is without warrant of law, and

Whereas: The said Juvenile Court, Hon. William H. DeLacy, judge, has DIRECTED THAT CERTAIN INFANTS COMING WITHIN THE JURISDICTION OF THE COURT, BE BAPTIZED INTO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH, which we submit is without warrant of law, and

Whereas: The said JUVENILE COURT, (HON. WILLIAM H. DELACY, JUDGE), HAS PRACTICALLY BECOME UNDER ITS PRESENT HEAD, A ROMAN CATHOLIC INSTITUTION, IN THE PERSONNEL OF ITS OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES, which we submit, it was not, and is not the intent of the act establishing said court; and is not in accordance with the letter and spirit of the constitution of the United States or the laws for the District of Columbia enacted in pursuance thereof, neither is it for the best interest of the community; and

Whereas: The term of office for which the said Judge William H. DeLacy was appointed expires during or about the month of July, 1912, it is

Resolved: By the Lutheran Ministerial Association of the city of Washington, that we respectfully and earnestly request the Hon. William Howard Taft, President of the United States, not to reappoint the said Judge William H. DeLacy to said position for another term; and that we respectfully and earnestly request the United States senate, should Judge DeLacy's name be sent to that honorable body for confirmation for another term, that they refuse to confirm such nomination; and it is further

Resolved: That the president and secretary of this Lutheran Ministerial Association be directed to place, at the earliest possible date, a copy of these resolutions in the hands of the president, and to take whatever steps may be necessary to have a copy of the same introduced or presented on the floor of the

By GILBERT O. NATIONS  
Vice-President Free Press Defense League,  
22 Bliss Building, 36 B Street, N. W.,  
Washington, D. C.

United States senate, that that body may officially refer them, in due course, to the appropriate committee having consideration of names presented to the senate for confirmation.

Attest: JOHN T. HEDDLE,  
C. H. BUTLER, Secretary. President,  
June 14, 1912.

About the same time facts shown on the record of the juvenile court were published in THE MENACE and in Watson's Magazine showing the following among many similar proceedings of that court:

1910, May 9. Annie Diehl, white, PROTESTANT, 13 years of age, who had been held in the House of Detention as a U. S. witness for Police Court, WAS SENT BY THE JUVENILE COURT TO THE "HOUSE OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD."

1910, Nov. 14. Sadie Dean, white, 13 years of age. Charged with incorrigibility. Sent to the "House of the Good Shepherd" by Juvenile court for one year.

1911, Jan. 14. Edith Daly, white, 15 years of age, married. Charged with incorrigibility by her husband, Charles H. Daly. Sentenced to "House of Good Shepherd" for two years.

1911, Feb. 10. Marie Biggs, white, 14 years of age. Charged with incorrigibility. Ordered by Juvenile Court to Providence Hospital (RC) and sentenced to "House of the Good Shepherd."

1912, Jan. 31. FLORENCE WALTON, WHITE, PROTESTANT, 16 YEARS OF AGE. Charged with being a fugitive from House of Mercy. Committed to "House of the Good Shepherd."

1911, Jan. 17. PRIEST GALIER WAS SENT BY THE JUVENILE COURT TO BAPTIZE AN INFANT CHILD OF MRS. MORTIMER, THEN at the Crittenton Home, and also to look after the spiritual welfare of Walter Kelley, at the National Training School for boys.

1911, Sept. 19. Twin infants were brought into the Juvenile Court and committed under the name of "Acton," the religious faith of whose parents was uncertain. The judge ORDERED MISS KING, ASSISTANT PROBATION OFFICER, TO TAKE THEM AT ONCE TO ST. VINCENT DE PAUL'S ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH AND HAVE THEM BAPTIZED IN THAT FAITH. This she did, acting as God-mother. (See Docket No. 12030, and note the change of name to Gotzendanner their baptismal name on the Docket Sept. 22, 1911.)

It was further shown and published widely at that time that the juvenile court was presided over by a Roman Catholic judge, and that its clerk, deputy clerk, bailiff, chief probation officer, first assistant probation officer and janitor were all Roman Catholics.

It was further shown that young girls nine years of age and upward, when brought before the juvenile court on charges of petty larceny and other childish offenses, were required by that court to submit to physical examination as to immoral relations with men. Horrified by such reckless and wanton abuse of judicial power, parents of the District easily became suspicious of the effort initiated by Mr. Johnson and his associates to place greatly enlarged power in the hands of the juvenile court.

At the threshold of the misleading remarks, Mr. Johnson insists,

as the Roman Catholic crowd always insist, that it is better for courts to commit children to sectarian institutions than to public institutions provided and conducted by the government for that purpose. He declares that forty-four states authorize their courts to commit children to such sectarian institutions. A glance at the statutes of these states discloses very wide divergences between the juvenile provisions contained in most of them and those contained in the Johnson bill.

In virtually all of those states, moreover, judges of the juvenile courts are elected directly by the people over whose children they are given jurisdiction; whereas, no resident of the District of Columbia has any voice in the selection of the judge of the District Juvenile Court. That functionary is to be appointed by officials from the inhabitants of the District have no voice in electing. This fact alone directs the people in the District of Columbia of the political power with which those residing elsewhere can so easily defend their rights.

In this connection it should be remembered that most residents of the District of Columbia depend for their living upon modest salaries earned in the employ of the government. This circumstance enables the petty tyrants that Rome has placed in so many positions of power in the government service to defy inhabitants of the District and by intimidation prevent them from even mildly asserting their rights.

The juvenile court bill for the District of Columbia as introduced by Mr. Johnson contained a provision in Section 30 which expressly empowered the judge of that court to defeat any appeal from his decisions by making such modifications of his record pending the appeal as would prevent a hearing in the appellate court. This provision was eliminated by an amendment before the bill left the House of Representatives.

In his wanton and apparently deliberate disregard of law and truth Mr. Johnson refers to the expressed fear that Protestant children will be incarcerated in Roman Catholic prisons and then states that no Protestant child can be so committed under this bill. BUT THEY HAVE BEEN SO COMMITTED BY THE JUVENILE COURT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. If Mr. Johnson had any regard for truth or for the faithful discharge of his duty he ought to know this; because he was a member of congress and chairman of the committee on the District of Columbia at that time.

He refers to Section 25 of the bill as rendering such commitment impossible. But that section provides only that the court "shall, SO FAR AS PRACTICABLE, select as the custodial agency some individual holding the same religious belief as the parents of such child, or some institution or association governed by persons of like religious faith." Any tyro in the law knows courts have uniformly declared that such statutory provisions have no binding or mandatory effect and are therefore nugatory.

On May 11 the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia granted a public hearing on this measure as it finally passed the House of Representatives. At that hearing the CHAMBER OF COMMERCE of the City of Washington urged by its able counsel thirty-five

(Continued on Page 2, Column 2)

## Is Mayor Mitchell the Jesuit's Stalking Horse for Vice-President?

Rome wants the vice-presidency. Rome would do much to secure that office. Signs are not wanting that indicate that the Jesuits may be preparing to spring Mayor Mitchell of New York City on the Democratic convention as the candidate for vice-president, urging that he has just defied Rome. Mr. Mitchell's recent utterance would serve most admirably to secure this end, if Mayor Mitchell's record of the past should be forgotten. Watch political Romanism at the St. Louis convention and see if a characteristic Jesuit trick is not attempted in the furtherance of the well-laid plans of the Roman hierarchy.